26 proper analysi

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANTOLIN ANDREWS,

Plaintiff,

2:01-cv-1621-GEB-GGH-P

VS.

TONI HAFEY, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

Plaintiff, a former state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed this civil rights action seeking relief under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local General Order No. 262.

On August 17, 2006, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations herein which were served on all parties and which contained notice to all parties that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within twenty days. Plaintiff has filed objections to the findings and recommendations.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C) and Local Rule 72-304, this court has conducted a <u>de novo</u> review of this case. Having carefully reviewed the entire file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by proper analysis.

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
2	1. The findings and recommendations filed August 17, 2006, are adopted in full;
3	and
4	2. This action is dismissed without prejudice. <u>See Local Rule 11-110</u> ; Fed. R.
5	Civ. P. 41(b).
6	Dated: October 3, 2006
7	/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
8	<u>/s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.</u> GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
1617	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	